

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The above identified application is presently under FINAL rejections. Examiner's prompt reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action dated September 26, 2003, claims 4 and 9 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Warren et al., EP 0 183 436. Claims 1, 4, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shoji et al. JP 10-204473. Claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tanida et al. JP 01-254628. Claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Warren et al. EP 0 183 436. Claims 1, 4, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanida et al., in view of Shoji et al. Claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warren et al., in view of Tanida et al., and Shoji et al. Claims 3, 6, 9, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanida et al.

In response to the objections and rejections, Applicants have cancelled claims 1-4, 7-9 and 13-14, and amended claim 10. Also, to counter the Examiner's assertion that Applicants have not provided any scientific data showing any unexpected and/or unusual results between the use of valerian oil (as disclosed by Warren et al.) and the use of fatty-acid-removed valterian oil (as claimed in the present claimed invention), and the difference between heat treated-valerian oil (as disclosed by Tanida et al.) and alkali treated-valerian oil (as claimed in the present claimed invention), a 132 Declaration signed by one of the inventors, Ken Shoji, is attached

together with this response. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments of claims 5 and 10 have overcome the rejections for the reasons set forth below.

Claim Objections

Claims 4 and 9 are objected as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

In response to the objections, Applicants have cancelled claims 4 and 9 so that this issue is moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite.

In response to the rejections, claim 13 is cancelled so that the issue is moot.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Warren et al. Claims 1, 4, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Shoji et al. Claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tanida et al.

In response to the rejections, Applicants have cancelled claims 1-4, 7-9, and 13-14. Thus, the only claims that are still of concern and still under the rejections are claims 5, 10, and 11.

Claim 5 is amended to further clarify that the fatty-acid-removed valerian oil is produced by an alkali treatment. This fact is recognized by the Examiner (e.g., by citing Shoji et al. on

pages 4, and 5) and supported by the application on for example, Paragraphs [0018], [0021], and Example 1. Claim 10 is also amended to further clarify that the phrase "reduce cortisol concentration in a human body" is NOT an intended use language by ensuring that the "reduce cortisol concentration" phrase in the preamble becomes a claim limitation.

"Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that disclosure in a single piece of prior art of each and every limitation of a claimed invention." *Electro med. Sys. S.A. v. Cooper Life Sciences*, 34 F.3d 1048, 1052 (Fed. Cir. 1994). *See also Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987) ("[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference"). Applicants respectfully submit that because not each and every limitations of the independent claims of the present claimed invention, as amended, are found in the above identified prior art, Applicants' claimed invention is not anticipated by the cited prior art.

Claim 5 is Not Anticipated By Tanida et al., JP 10-204473

Tanida et al. teach a valerian oil distilled out at $\leq 80^{\circ}\text{C}$ under 0.08 mmHg vacuum that is free of malodor. As acknowledged by the Examiner, Tanida et al. do not teach that the valerian oil is free from fatty acid.

Claim 5, as amended, recites as follows:

"A method for relieving stresses in humans comprising inhaling an effective quantity of a fatty-acid-removed valerian oil produced by alkali treatment; wherein said fatty-acid-removed valerian oil is an active component of a perfume; and wherein said stress is relieved due to a reduction in cortisol concentration in said humans."

As evident by the scientific data provided in paragraph 4 and Table 1 of the enclosed 132 Declaration, the fraction of valerian oil that is used by Tanida et al. (i.e., a fraction distilled out at $\leq 80^{\circ}\text{C}$) is not free from fatty acids, because the boiling point of isovaleric acid (the majority fatty acids in valerian oil) is 176°C so that at the temperature of $\leq 80^{\circ}\text{C}$, the majority of the fatty acids are not distilled out of the valerian oil. Alternatively, if heat treatment is high enough to be used to sufficiently remove all of the fatty acids, the valerian oil thus produced would be devoid of many other components due to the fact that these components have similar boiling points as that of the isovaleric acid. Since the fatty-acid-removed valerian oil is NOT the same as the fraction of valerian oil distilled out at $\leq 80^{\circ}\text{C}$, the amended claim 5 is not anticipated by Tanida et al.

Claim 10 is Not Anticipated by Either Warren et al. Or Tanida et al.

The amended claim 10, as amended, recites as follows:

"A method for decreasing cortisol value in humans comprising allowing said humans to inhale an effective quantity of a fatty-acid-removed valerian oil produced by an alkali treatment so as to decrease said cortisol value in said humans."

First, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Warren et al. do not teach or suggest the use of a fatty-acid-removed valerian oil produced by an alkali treatment. Also, as indicated in Figure 1 and Paragraph 3 of the enclosed 132 Declaration, the effect of a fatty-acid-removed valerian oil on stress relieve is definitely superior to that of valerian oil alone.

Secondly, unlike what is alleged by the Examiner that "decreasing cortisol value" is an intended use language, this term is embedded in both the preamble and the body of the amended claim 10. Language in a preamble is a limitation on a claim if "its appearance in the count gives

'life and meaning' to the manipulative steps." See Kropa v. Robie, 187 F.2d 150, 152 (CCPA 1951); See also Locite Corp. v. Ultraseal Ltd., 781 F.2d 861 (Fed. Cir. 1985); Bell Communications Research, Inc. v. Vitalink Communications Corp., 55 F.3d 615 (Fed. Cir. 1995); C.R. Bard, Inc. v. M3 Systems, Inc., 157 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 1998). In the amended claim 10, the phrase "decrease in cortisol value in humans" in the preamble is a necessary limitation because it constitutes the patentability of the claim since what is claimed is the "new use." Also, the phrase "decrease in cortisone value in humans" in the preamble clearly "breathes life and meaning" into the claim because without the "use," the claim becomes meaningless. Thus, the phrase "decrease in cortisol value in humans" in the preamble is a claim limitation as defined by the Federal Circuit. Therefore, the amended claim 10 is definitely not anticipated by Warren et al.

As to Tanida et al., Applicants incorporate by reference their arguments in support of no anticipation of Claim 5 over Tanida et al. (supra). Since Tanida et al. do not teach the "decrease in cortisol value" and also do not use "fatty-acid-removed valerian oil", the amended claim 10 is not anticipated by Tanida et al.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Warren et al. In addition, claims 1, 4, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanida et al., in view of Shoji et al. Furthermore, claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Warren et al., in view

of Tanida et al., and Shoji et al. Finally, claims 3, 6, 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanida et al.

As indicated previously, claims 1, 3, 4, 9, and 13-14 are cancelled. Claim 6 is a dependent claim of claim 5, and claim 11 is a dependent claim of claim 10, thus, if claims 5 and 10 are patentable over the prior art, claims 6 and 11 should also be patentable.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the prior art reference must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP § 706.02(j), citing In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicants incorporate by reference their arguments submitted on July 17, 2003, in traversing the unobvious rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants further supplement their arguments as shown below:

Claim 5 is Not Obvious Over Warren et al., Tanida et al. Or Shoji et al., Alone or In Any Combination

In response to the multiple rejections under different combination of prior art, Applicants have amended claim 5 to clarify (a) that the fatty-acid-removed valerian oil is produced by an alkali treatment; and (2) that the reduction of cortisol value in human body is clearly a claim limitation by modifying the last "wherein" clause to recite -- wherein said stress is relieved due to a reduction in cortisol concentration in human body --.

In addition, in response to the Examiner's assertion that Applicants have not presented any scientific data in support of the differences in stress relieving effect between fatty-acid-removed valerian oil (i.e., claimed in the present invention), and valerian oil (i.e., disclosed in Warren et al.) or a fraction of the valerian oil distilled at $\leq 80^{\circ}\text{C}$ (i.e., Tanida et al.), Applicants

have submitted a 132 Declaration to show that the fatty-acid-removed valerian oil has superior stress relieving capacity to valerian oil, and the fatty-acid-removed valerian oil produced by alkali treatment contains different components than the fraction of valerian oil after being distilled to $\leq 80^{\circ}\text{C}$. Thus, it is clear that Warren et al. or Tanida et al. alone or in combination do not teach or suggest the invention claimed in the amended claim 5.

As to Shoji et al., as acknowledged by the Examiner, there is no teaching nor suggestion by Shoji et al. that the fatty-acid-removed valerian oil has stress relieving effect. Thus, it is clear that Shoji et al. alone do not teach nor suggest the invention claimed in the amended claim 5.

As to the combined teachings of Tanida et al. in view of Shoji et al., or Warren et al. in view of Tanida et al. and Shoji et al., the key limitation that " said stress is relieved due to a reduction in cortisol concentration in said humans" is clearly missing in all of the prior art references.

The Examiner's argument that the limitation of "reducing cortisol concentration in a human body" is an intended use language is without merit, particularly because in this case the amended claim 5 is a "method of use" claim, not a product claim, so that the "inherency" issue raised by the Examiner does not apply to the claim (because a new use of an old compound is clearly patentable under 35 U.S.C. §§ 100 & 101). Please note that even if the Examiner construes the "reducing cortisol concentration" limitation to be a functional limitation, it is known that functional language should be considered to be a limitation. See e.g., Pac-Tec, Inc. v. Amerace Corp., 903 F.2d 796, 801 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Therefore, the amended claim 5 is not obvious over Warren et al., Tanida et al., or Shoji et al. alone, or over Tanida et al. in view of Shoji et al., or Warren in view of Tanida et al. and Shoji et al. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claim 10 is Not Obvious Over Warren et al., Tanida et al. Or Shoji et al., Alone or In Any Combination

In addition to the arguments shown above (*supra*), claim 10 is also not obvious over Warren et al., Tanida et al., or shoji et al., alone or in any combination for the following reasons.

Claim 10 is a "method of use" claim directed to a method of reducing cortisol value in humans. Under the current U.S. Patent Law, a new use of a known process, machine, manufacture, composition of matter, or material is a patentable invention under 35 U.S.C. §§ 100 & 101. See 35 U.S.C. § 100(b) ("The term 'process' means process, art or method, and includes a new use of a know process, machine, manufacture, composition of matter, or material"); 35 U.S.C. § 101 ("Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title").

The preamble in a "method of use" claim is certainly a limitation to the claim because it "breathes life and meaning" into the claim and is a "necessary" element in determining the patentability of the invention. In addition, to ensure that the limitation of "reducing the cortisol concentration" is to be considered as a claim limitation, Applicants have amended claim 10 to include the phrase "to inhale an effective quantity of a fatty-acid-removed valerian oil produced by an alkali treatment so as to decrease said cortisol value in said humans" in the body of the

claim. This further strengthens Applicants' position that the decrease in cortisol value in humans is a limitation to Applicants' "method of use" claim.

Thus, the amended claim 5 is not obvious over Warren et al., Tanida et al., or Shoji et al. alone, or over Tanida et al. in view of Shoji et al., or Warren in view of Tanida et al. and Shoji et al. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 6 and 11 are Not Obvious Over Warren et al., Tanida et al. Or Shoji et al., Alone or In Any Combination

It is well-settled that if an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. See, e.g., In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Since claim 6 is a dependent claim of claim 5, and claim 11 is a dependent claim of claim 10, since claims 5 and 10, as amended, are not obvious over Warren et al., Tanida et al., or Shoji et al., alone or in any combination, claims 6, and 11 are not obvious over Tanida et al.

In view of the foregoing, the rejections have been overcome and the claims are in condition for allowance, early notice of which is requested. Should the application not be passed for issuance, the examiner is requested to contact the applicant's attorney to resolve the problem.

Respectfully submitted,



Fei-Fei Chao, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 43,538

Date: December 24, 2003

Fei-Fei Chao, Ph.D.
Venable, Baetjer, Howard & Civiletti, LLP
1201 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel.: (202) 216-8011

doc# 500863